



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by studying England's attitude towards Voltaire; and giving a minute account of these forgotten English criticisms, he has written a valuable contribution to literary history. Voltaire's works were at first kindly received; then his attacks—in the prefaces to *Mérope* and *Sémiramis*—roused resentment. We observe that Voltaire's opponents were mostly obscure men; great critics like Johnson, when urged to take arms in Shakespeare's cause, declined to do so; the resentment, moreover, did not endure long: to the *Letter to the Academy* the English showed indifference. The reason was that the contest, as far as it interested England, had been decided in favor of Shakespeare; perhaps was it also because the English in the eighteenth century did not care much for literary disputes.

In conclusion, Professor Lounsbury regrets that Voltaire retarded on the Continent a due appreciation of Shakespeare. It seems hardly probable that Voltaire, had his authority, great as it was, been used in the interest of Shakespeare, could have altered his countrymen's taste. Even to-day, in spite of the romanticists, Voltaire's appreciation remains that of most Frenchmen: "an inspired barbarian" they call the English poet, some laying stress on the adjective, but the greater number on the noun.

A careful regard for composition and style enhances the value of a book which, though containing some points open to dispute, offers an undeniable interest. Students of comparative literature will especially be thankful to Professor Lounsbury for the chapters on the attitude taken towards Voltaire by the English.¹

CH. BASTIDE.

Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors. By John Garrett Underhill. New York: Published for the Columbia University Press by The Macmillan Company, 1899. Pp. x, 438.

This book, the object of which is 'to determine, within certain limits, the place which the literature of Spain and Portugal occupied

¹ The word *costume* (custom), p. 232, was, according to Littré, introduced into French from the Italian in the time of Louis XIII. With reference to Voltaire it could hardly be called a 'recent' word.

in the minds and lives of English writers previous to the death of Elizabeth,' forms a welcome addition to the goodly number of studies on the literary relations between England and Spain which have appeared during the last two-decades or more. The author begins with a brief account of the contact between the two countries from the year 1170—when Henry II gave his daughter Eleanor in marriage, not to Alphonso VII of Castile and Leon (1126–1157), as Mr. Underhill says, but to Alphonso VIII of Castile (1158–1214)—to the second half of the sixteenth century. During that period, England was under the intellectual influence of Italy and France, while her intercourse with the Spanish peninsula was practically limited to politics and commerce, so that 'the rise and power of Castilian culture in the home of the Tudors were determined by and sensitive to the successive phases of the political contest between the English and the Spanish nations.' It was therefore chiefly through Latin, Italian, and French versions that Spanish works at first became known to the English, as e. g. the *Celestina* in 1530 through Rastell's adaptation of the Italian translation of Alphonso Ordoñez. Later, from the time of Mary and Philip II, translation was more and more the result of the direct study of Spanish originals, as is the case with Thomas Paynel's English rendering (published in 1568) of the *Amadis de Gaula*. In the peculiar character of the relations existing between the two nations, Mr. Underhill further finds an explanation for the classes of Spanish works with which the English became acquainted during this time. These were either of an occasional and didactic character, or purely literary in their nature, with a decided preponderance of those publications serving a practical purpose. To the first class belong the treatises on military tactics and on navigation, the chronicles of sea-voyages, etc., which interested the English soldier, sailor, and merchant. To the second or literary class, which was naturally of a more abiding influence, belong the moral court-treatises, such as those of Antonio de Guevara; the pastoral novels, in the present case exclusively represented by the *Diana* of Montemayor; the romances of chivalry, such as the *Amadis de Gaula* and the series of the *Palmerins*, all of which strongly appealed to the courtly circles of England; and last, though not least, the picaresc novel, *Lazarillo de Tormes*, rendered into English by David Rowland before 1576, and destined to attain to considerable popularity under the Stuarts. Mr. Underhill duly

notes the important fact that three other literary *genres* in which Spain excelled in the 16th and 17th centuries, and in which her genius found its most typical expression—the epic, the lyric, and the drama—exerted scarcely any influence upon the England of the sixteenth century. The Spanish ballads, as he correctly says, were too intensely national, both in form and feeling, to flourish upon any but their own soil. As for the lyric poetry of Castile, highly developed though it was, it could not impose itself successfully upon the attention of the English for several reasons. The style cultivated by the native school, the foremost champion of which in that period was Cristóbal de Castillejo, was too national, too local almost, to call forth an echo in England, while the Italian style, followed and firmly established by such singers as Boscan, Garcilaso de la Vega, and Camoens, was already known to the English through the direct influence of Petrarch and his school. According to Mr. Underhill (p. 267), the second and third lyrics of the first book of the *Diana* of Montemayor, which Sidney rendered into English in his *Arcadia*, and part of the sixth eclogue of Googe, are the only Spanish lyric poetry which was translated into English, independently of any prose setting, before the accession of James I. The Spanish drama, finally, had not sufficiently matured its forms in the sixteenth century to invite imitation abroad. Barring such few exceptions as the *Celestina* and Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, it is only in the reign of the Stuarts that the direct influence of Castile upon English playwrights makes itself felt. This opinion is in accord with the one advanced in 1890 by A. L. Stiefel in the excellent article published in Vol. 5 of the *Romanische Forschungen* under the title: 'Die Nachahmung Spanischer Komödien in England unter den ersten Stuarts,' and it is strange that Mr. Underhill should nowhere in his book mention this and other important recent contributions to the study of the literary relations of England with Spain, such as E. Koepfel's *Geschichte der Italienischen Novelle in der Englischen Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Strassburg, 1892, and the same writer's 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Elizabethan Dramas,' in *Englische Studien*, Vol. 16, and 'Zur Quellenkunde des Stuart-Dramas,' in *Archiv für Neuere Sprachen*, Vol. 97.¹

¹ Other contributions to this subject are the following :

Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries, from 1520, their Lives and Writings, according to the late Benjamin B. Wiffen's Plan, and with the Use of his Materials.

One cannot follow Mr. Underhill in his diligent and useful, though rather diffuse, investigation of the various channels through which Spanish thought penetrated into the England of the sixteenth century without regretting that he should not prove better acquainted than he appears to be with some of the more familiar results of modern research in the field of Spanish literature which were easily accessible to him in Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *History of Spanish Literature*, a book which figures in the list of 'Authorities consulted,' and in the critical studies of Portuguese and Spanish literature by Mrs. C. M. de Vasconcellos and by G. Baist in Vol. 2 of the well-known *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie*, edited by Gröber (1893). A proper consultation of these works, which is indispensable to any one dealing with the literary history of the Spanish peninsula, would have prevented him from committing the following more or less serious errors. On p. 39 the *Celestina*, which, as is well-known, was composed toward the end of the fifteenth century, is termed a 'masterpiece of fourteenth-century Spain.' On p. 41, the Marques de Santillana is referred to as 'the most popular of the poets of the pre-Italian period,' while on p. 78 the author commits a further error in the partially contradictory statement in regard to 'the allegorical method, . . . which is that of the School of Santillana and the fourteenth-century poets who amused themselves with contriving variations of the machinery of Dante;' and finally, on p. 271, he tells us that 'Wyatt and Surrey . . . were cultivating the Italian manner in England while the Spaniards [this time in the sixteenth century!] were introducing it in the peninsula.' The fact is that with the possible exception of Fran-

Described by Edward Boehmer. . . . Strassburg and London. 2 vols. Trübner, 1874-1883.

Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles. Por D. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo. Madrid, 1880.

The Influence of the Celestina on the Early English Drama. By A. S. W. Rosenbach. Berlin, 1903. Reprinted from *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, Vol. 39.

'Die Celestina in England.' In Appendix (p. 68) of W. Fehse's Dissertation on *Christof Wirsung's Deutsche Celestina-Uebersetzungen*. Halle a/S, 1902.

Die Preciosa des Cervantes. Von W. v. Wurzbach. In *Studien zur Vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte* 1. 391.

'"The Curious-Impertinent"' in English Dramatic Literature before Shelton's Translation of Don Quixote.' By A. S. W. Rosenbach. In *Modern Language Notes*, 17 (1902) 179-184.

cisco Imparcial of Seville, who flourished in the reign of Henry III and during the early years of John II of Castile, there is no Castilian poet in the fourteenth century who is known to have imitated Dante, and that the Marques de Santillana (b. 1398, d. 1458) was one of the first Castilian poets to adopt the form of the Italian sonnet and the hendecasyllabic verse, and to render Dante into Spanish.

Mr. Underhill invariably (pp. 45, 46, 51, 75, 274, 370, 384) speaks of the *Lazarillo de Tormes* as the work of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, without ever so much as suspecting, apparently, that there are very weighty reasons for doubting the correctness of this attribution, which, as is well known, appeared for the first time in 1607, i. e. fifty-three years after the first publication of the book. These reasons are fully stated by Morel-Fatio in his *Études sur l'Espagne*, Première Série, Paris, 1888 and 1895, a work which Mr. Underhill quotes in his list of 'Authorities consulted' (p. 423), and are duly considered by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, who is cited in the same list. But what is still more singular is the following addition made to the title quoted in the Bibliography of the Spanish works published in the England of the Tudors, under the year 1576: 'Translated by David Rowland from the *Lazarillo de Tormes* of Diego Hurtado de Mondoza (?), Burgos, 1554.' From this one must infer that Mr. Underhill somewhere, in some contemporary mention of Rowland's version, found the story attributed to Mendoza in the misspelled form Mondoza. Where he found this he does not say. None of the editions of David Rowland's version contains such an attribution.

What the author says on p. 300 in regard to the *Palmerins* shows that he is not familiar with the important fact, established beyond a doubt since 1882 (cf. e. g. *Zeitsch. f. Rom. Philol.*, Vol. 6, and *Romania* 11. 619) that the *Palmerin of England* was originally composed in Portuguese by Francisco de Moraes between 1540 and 1546. On the same page the reader is informed that three of the four books of Garcia Ordoñez de Montalvo's arrangement of the *Amadis de Gaula* were furnished him from the Portuguese adaptation of Vasco de Lobeira. Here, again, Fitzmaurice-Kelly could have put Mr. Underhill on his guard. But as long ago as 1880 (*Zeitsch. f. Rom. Philol.*, Vol. 4) Mrs. C. M. de Vasconcellos had rendered it highly probable, if not absolutely certain, that the author of the Portuguese version of the *Amadis* was not the fifteenth-century Vasco de Lobeira, but an ancestor of his, Joham (Pires) Lobeira, a

Portuguese troubadour of the second half of the thirteenth century. This subject is also discussed at length in Vol. 2 of Gröber's *Grundriss der Rom. Philol.*, pp. 219-221 and 440-441.

With the exception of these and a few other errors and omissions, Mr. Underhill's book deserves to be recommended as a useful contribution to the study of the literary relations between England and Spain in the sixteenth century.

H. R. LANG.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Geschichte der norwegisch-isländischen Literatur. von Eugen Mogk. [*Nordische Literaturen A. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*², II Band. 3 Lieferung, 1902, 4 Lieferung, 1903]. Pp. 555-923.

A history of Old Norse-Icelandic literature most naturally falls into three parts: 1. Eddic poetry; 2. Skaldic poetry; 3. The Sagas. Chronologically, we cannot, indeed, draw any hard and fast line between the first two,—we cannot, *e. g.*, speak of an Eddic period and a Skaldic period for, on the one hand, even the *Þrymskviða* and the oldest parts of the *Hávamál*, are undoubtedly antedated by Bragi inn gamli and only contemporary with Þorbjörn Hornklofi, and on the other, many lays usually called 'Eddic' are of a comparatively late period. Nor can the two be set apart formally as absolutely distinct. Nevertheless, the Eddic lays represent an earlier stage, a more popular form of poetry, while the skaldic lays are the more artificial product of the court poets. The former contain in songs, whose authors we do not know, the divine myths and the heroic sagas, that were to a large extent the common property of the people, while the poetry of the skalds is historical, and the authors in nearly every case known. The poems of the Elder Edda belong to different ages just as they may be far removed in point of place within the West Scandinavian North. In general, we may say they have been composed between 850 and 1050. Among late post-Eddic poems called 'Eddic' because they are similar in character to the lays of the Codex Regius of the Elder Edda belongs also the *Grípsþá*, which is a later interpolation into the original collection. The skalds *Kormák*, *Hallfreðr Vandræðaskáld*, *Gunnlaugr*, *Sighvatr*, *Þormoðr Kolbrunarskáld* and